



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/285,632	04/02/1999	NATHANIEL T. BECKER	GC530-2	3949

7590 11/20/2001  
KRISTEN A ANDERSON  
GENENCOR INTERNATIONAL INC  
925 PAGE MILL ROAD  
PALO ALTO, CA 943041013

EXAMINER

TRAN, SUSAN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2001

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/285,632

Applicant(s)  
Becker et al.

Examiner  
Susan Tran

Group Art Unit  
1615



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Susan Tran

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mrs. Castaneda

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Nov 15, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 57

Identification of prior art discussed:

Oshlack et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's attorney pointed out that Oshlack teaches from 0.1 to 80% of the modified cellulose, and therefore is not obvious over the claimed invention.

The examiner pointed out that the amount is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

THURMAN K. PAGE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.